arXiv:1703.06558v1 [stat.ME] 20 Mar 2017

Using maximum entry-wise deviation to test the goodness-of-fit for stochastic block models

Jianwei Hu, Hong Qin, Ting Yan, and Ji Zhu
Central China Normal University & University of Michigan

March 21, 2017

Abstract

The stochastic block model is widely used for detecting community structures in network data. How to test the goodness-of-fit of the model is one of the fundamental problems and has gained growing interests in recent years. In this paper, we propose a new goodness-of-fit test based on the maximum entry of the centered and re-scaled observed adjacency matrix for the stochastic block model in which the number of communities can be allowed to grow linearly with the number of nodes ignoring a logarithm factor. We demonstrate that its asymptotic null distribution is the Gumbel distribution. Our results can also be extended to the degree corrected block model. Numerical studies indicate the proposed method works well.

KEY WORDS: Degree corrected stochastic block model; Goodness-of-fit test; Network data; Stochastic block model.

*Jianwei Hu, Department of Statistics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, P.R. China, 430079, Email: jwhu@mail.ccnu.edu.cn. Hong Qin, Department of Statistics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, P.R. China, 430079, Email: qinhong@mail.ccnu.edu.cn. Ting Yan, Department of Statistics, Central China Normal University, Wuhan, P.R. China, 430079, Email: tingyanty@mail.ccnu.edu.cn. Ji Zhu, Department of statistics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA, Email: jizhu@umich.edu.

1 Introduction

One of the fundamental problems in network data analysis is the community detection that aims to divide nodes into groups such that the links are dense within groups and relatively sparse between groups. The stochastic block model proposed by Holland, Laskey and Leinhardt (1983) is a popular approach to this end; for applications, see Snijders and Nowicki (1997) and Nowicki and Snijders (2001).

In a stochastic block model with k communities, n nodes are clustered into k groups, i.e., there exists a mapping: $\sigma : [n] \to [k]^n$, where $[n] = \{1, \ldots, n\}$. Then, the entries A_{ij} $(i > j)$ of the symmetric adjacency matrix $A \in \{0,1\}^{n\times n}$ of an undirected random graph $\mathcal{G}$ are mutually independent Bernoulli random variables with the occurrence probabilities $P_{ij} = B_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}$ for certain symmetric probability matrix $B \in [0,1]^{k\times k}$. A large number of methods for recovering the community labels have been proposed, including modularity [Newman (2006)], likelihood maximization [Amini et al. (2013)], variational methods [Daudin, Picard and Robin (2008)] and spectral clustering [Rohe, Chatterjee and Yu (2011); Jin (2015)]. For review, see Bhattacharyya and Bickel (2015). Asymptotic properties of the estimators of the community labels have also been established [e.g., Choi, Wolfe and Airoldi (2012); Rohe, Chatterjee and Yu (2011); Zhao, Levina and Zhu (2012); Sarkar and Bickel (2015); Jin (2015); Lei and Rinaldo (2015); Zhang and Zhou (2015)]. However, how to validate the stochastic block model is a challenging problem and has not been addressed only until recently. Wang and Bickel (2016) developed a likelihood-based approach to test the model and derived the asymptotic null distribution of the log-likelihood ratio statistic under model misspecification when the block number k is fixed. Bickel and Sarkar (2015) used the largest eigenvalue of the centered and scaled adjacency matrix to test the Erdős–Rényi model and derived the asymptotic null distribution. By extending their arguments, Lei (2016) developed a goodness-of-fit test for stochastic block models using the largest singular value of the centered and re-scaled adjacency matrix and derived its asymptotic null distribution when

the condition $k = o(n^{1/6})$ holds. However, it seems difficult to extend these results to the more realistic degree corrected block model.

In this paper, we propose a new goodness-of-fit test based on the maximum entry-wise deviation of the centered and re-scaled observed adjacency matrix. We show that its asymptotic null distribution is the Gumbel distribution when $k = O(n/\log n)$. This condition implies that k is allowed to grow linearly with n ignoring a logarithm factor. Rohe, Qin and Fan (2014) called it the highest dimensional stochastic block model as the number of communities must be smaller than the number of nodes, and no reasonable model would allow k to grow faster. As a result, it significantly relaxes the condition in Lei (2016). The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce the new test statistic and state the asymptotic null distribution. We extend our results to the degree corrected stochastic block model in Section 3. The numerical studies are given in Section 4. All proofs are relegated to the appendix.

2 A new goodness-of-fit test

Consider a stochastic block model on n nodes with the membership vector σ and probability matrix B. Given (σ, B), the probability mass function for the adjacency matrix A is

$$P(A) = \prod_{1 \le i < j \le n} B_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)}^{A_{ij}} (1 - B_{\sigma(i)\sigma(j)})^{(1-A_{ij})}.$$

Given an observed adjacency matrix A, a positive integer k_0, and a membership vector σ_0, one may want to know whether A can be well fitted by a stochastic block model with k_0 and σ_0. This leads to the test of fitness of stochastic block models with the null hypothesis:

$$H_0 : k = k_0, \sigma = \sigma_0.$$

Given σ_0 and k_0, the maximum likelihood estimate of B is given by

$$\hat{B}_{uv} = \begin{cases} \frac{\sum_{i\in\sigma_0^{-1}(u), j\in\sigma_0^{-1}(v)} A_{ij}}{|\sigma_0^{-1}(u)||\sigma_0^{-1}(v)|}, & u \neq v, \\ \frac{\sum_{i\neq j\in\sigma_0^{-1}(u)} A_{ij}}{|\sigma_0^{-1}(u)|(|\sigma_0^{-1}(u)|-1)}, & u = v, \end{cases}$$

and we define the centered and re-scaled adjacency matrix $\tilde{A}$ by

$$\tilde{A}_{ij} = \begin{cases} \frac{A_{ij}-\hat{P}_{ij}}{\sqrt{(n-1)\hat{P}_{ij}(1-\hat{P}_{ij})}}, & i \neq j \\ 0, & i = j, \end{cases}$$

where

$$\sigma_0^{-1}(u) = \{i : 1 \leq i \leq n, \sigma(i) = u\}, \hat{P}_{ij} = \hat{B}_{\sigma_0(i)\sigma_0(j)}.$$

By assuming $k = o(n^{1/6})$, Lei (2016) showed that

$$n^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\tilde{A}) - 2) \xrightarrow{P} TW_1 \text{ and } n^{2/3}(-\lambda_n(\tilde{A}) - 2) \xrightarrow{P} TW_1,$$

where TW_1 denotes the Tracy-Widom distribution with index 1 and $\lambda_i(A)$ denotes the i-th largest eigenvalue of the matrix A. Further, Lei (2016) proposed the following test statistic:

$$\max[n^{2/3}(\lambda_1(\tilde{A}) - 2), n^{2/3}(-\lambda_n(\tilde{A}) - 2)]$$

to test whether the network data can be fitted by the stochastic block model.

We note that k and σ are implicit in Lei (2016), and as a result, the probability of type I error may be larger than the nominal level. Furthermore, it seems difficult to extend these results to the more realistic degree corrected block model. To overcome these disadvantages, it is natural to develop a new statistic that satisfies the following three conditions: (1) k and σ are explicit in the new statistic; (2) k is allowed to grow faster than $o(n^{1/6})$; (3) the new statistic can be easily extended to the degree corrected block model. In this paper, we

propose a new test statistic based on the maximum entry-wise deviation:

$$L_n \triangleq \max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k_0} \mid \rho_{iv} \mid,$$

where $\rho_{iv} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma_0^{-1}(v)|}} \sum_{j\in\sigma_0^{-1}(v)} \frac{A_{ij}-\hat{P}_{ij}}{\sqrt{\hat{P}_{ij}(1-\hat{P}_{ij})}}$.

To derive the asymptotic distribution for L_n, we make the following mild assumptions..

(A1) The entries of B are uniformly bounded away from 0 to 1.

(A2) There exists $C > 0$ such that $\min_{1\le u\le k} \mid \sigma^{-1}(u) \mid \ge Cn/k$ for all n.

Note condition (A1) was also used in Lei (2016). Condition (A2) requires that the size of each community is at least proportional to n/k. This is a reasonable and mild condition, for example, it is satisfied almost surely if the membership vector σ is generated from a multinominal distribution with n trials and probability $\pi = (\pi_1, \ldots, \pi_k)$ such that $\min_{1\le i\le k} \pi_i \ge C/k$. This condition was also used in Lei (2016) and Wang and Bickel (2016).

Asymptotic properties of L_n are stated below, while the proof is given in the supplemental material.

Theorem 1. *Suppose that conditions (A1) and (A2) hold. Under the null hypothesis* $H_0 : k = k_0$, $\sigma = \sigma_0$, *if* $k = O(n/\log n)$, *then as* $n \to \infty$, *we have*

$$\frac{L_n}{\sqrt{\log(2k_0n)}} \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{2} \quad \textit{and} \tag{2.1}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(L_n^2 - 2\log(2k_0n) + \log\log(2k_0n) \le y) = \exp\{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-y/2}\}, \tag{2.2}$$

where the right hand side of (2.2) is the cumulative distribution function of the Gumbel distribution with $\mu = -2\log(2\sqrt{\pi})$ *and* $\beta = 2$.

By the above theorem we can test the null hypothesis H_0 using the test statistic

$$T_n = L_n^2 - 2\log(2k_0 n) + \log\log(2k_0 n).$$

Specifically, we reject $H_0 : k = k_0$ if $T_n > t_{(1-\alpha/2)}$ or $T_n < t_{\alpha/2}$, where $t_{\alpha/2}$ is the $\alpha/2$ quantile of the Gumbel distribution.

Remark 1. Although we use the maximum entry-wise deviation to test the goodness-of-fit for stochastic block models, the block number k is allowed to be fixed. This is a great difference between our method and the general maximum entry-wise deviation methods, where k is required to be infinite. The reason is that the node number n is embedded in the statistic L_n.

3 Extension to a degree-corrected stochastic block model

A typical network often contains a handful of high degree "hub" nodes having many edges and many low degree nodes having few edges. To incorporate the degree heterogeneity of nodes for community detection, Karrer and Newman (2011) proposed the degree corrected stochastic block model. Specifically, the degree corrected stochastic block model assumes that $P(A_{ij} = 1 \mid \sigma(i) = u, \sigma(j) = v) = \omega_i \omega_j B_{uv}$, where $\omega = (\omega_i)_{1 \le i \le n}$ are a set of node degree parameters measuring the degree variation. For identifiability of the model, we use the following constraint for the degree corrected stochastic block model.

(A3) $\sum_i \omega_i \mathbf{1}\{\sigma(i) = u\} = |\sigma^{-1}(u)|$ for each community $1 \le u \le k$.

Similar to Karrer and Newman (2011), we replace the Bernoulli distribution of A_{ij} by the Poisson distribution with the mean $\omega_i \omega_j B_{uv}$. As discussed in Zhao, Levina and Zhu (2012), there is no practical difference in performance between the log-likelihood and its slightly more elaborate version based on the true Bernoulli observations. The reason is that the

Bernoulli distribution with a small mean is well approximated by the Poisson distribution. One advantage of using the Poisson distribution is that it greatly simplifies the calculations. Another advantage is that it admits networks containing both multi-edges and self-edges.

To develop a goodness-of-fit test for the degree corrected stochastic block model, we consider two cases: (1) ω is known and (2) ω is unknown. We first consider the case where ω is known, which was also assumed by Lei (2016), Gao, Ma, Zhang and Zhou (2016) in their theoretical analyses. In this case, we propose the following test statistic

$$L_{n1} \triangleq \max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k_0} | \tau_{iv} |,$$

where $\tau_{iv} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma_0^{-1}(v)|}} \sum_{j\in\sigma_0^{-1}(v)} \frac{A_{ij}-\omega_i\omega_j\hat{P}_{ij}}{\sqrt{\omega_i\omega_j\hat{P}_{ij}(1-\omega_i\omega_j\hat{P}_{ij})}}$.

To derive the asymptotic distribution of L_{n1} under the null hypothesis, we make the following additional assumption.

(A4) The entries of $(\omega_i\omega_j B_{\sigma_0(i)\sigma_0(j)})_{1\le i\le n, 1\le j\le n}$ are uniformly bounded away from 0 and 1.

Asymptotic properties of L_{n1} are stated below, while the proof is similar to that of Theorem 1 and thus omitted.

Theorem 2. *Suppose that conditions (A2)-(A4) hold. Under the null hypothesis $H_0 : k = k_0$, $\sigma = \sigma_0$, if $k = O(n/\log n)$, then as $n \to \infty$, we have*

$$\frac{L_{n1}}{\sqrt{\log(2k_0n)}} \xrightarrow{P} \sqrt{2} \quad \textit{and} \tag{3.1}$$

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(L_{n1}^2 - 2\log(2k_0n) + \log\log(2k_0n) \le y) = \exp\{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}}e^{-y/2}\}. \tag{3.2}$$

If ω is unknown, we can plug in its estimate for L_{n1}. Specifically, under the degree corrected stochastic block model, the maximum likelihood estimate of the parameter ω is

given by $\hat{\omega}_i = |\sigma_0^{-1}(u)|d_i / \sum_{j:\sigma_0(j)=\sigma_0(i)} d_j$, where $d_i = \sum_{1\le j\le n} A_{ij}$. Then the proposed plug-in test statistic is given by

$$L_{n2} \triangleq \max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k_0} \mid \tau_{iv} \mid,$$

where $\tau_{iv} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma_0^{-1}(v)|}} \sum_{j\in\sigma_0^{-1}(v)} \frac{A_{ij}-\hat{\omega}_i\hat{\omega}_j\hat{P}_{ij}}{\sqrt{\hat{\omega}_i\hat{\omega}_j\hat{P}_{ij}(1-\hat{\omega}_i\hat{\omega}_j\hat{P}_{ij})}}$.

Remark 2. We note that when ω is unknown, it is difficult to derive the asymptotic distribution of L_{n2} as the dependence of the terms in the summation of the above expression is complicated. Instead, we did some simulation studies and found that the empirical distribution of $L_{n2}^2 - 2\log(2k_0n) + \log\log(2k_0n)$ deviates from the Gumbel distribution (see Figure 2 (b)). However, we also found that when L_{n2} is adjusted as $L_{n3} = \sqrt{\frac{k_0+1}{k_0}} L_{n2}$, the deviation becomes small, especially when the number of blocks k is small. Thus we use $L_{n3} - 2\log(2k_0n) + \log\log(2k_0n)$ as an empirically modified test statistic for the degree corrected stochastic block model.

4 Numerical studies

4.1 Simulations

In this section, we carry out simulation studies to evaluate the performance of the proposed test statistic. We consider both the stochastic block model and the degree corrected stochastic block model. In the stochastic block model setting, spectral clustering is used to obtain the community labels, whereas in the degree corrected stochastic block model setting, the SCORE algorithm [Jin (2015)] is employed.

Note that for the stochastic block model, $T_n = L_n^2 - 2\log(2k_0n) + \log\log(2k_0n)$. For the degree corrected stochastic block model, we define $T_{ni} = L_{ni}^2 - 2\log(2k_0n) + \log\log(2k_0n)$, where $i = 1, 2, 3$.



Figure 1: Stochastic block model: empirical distribution of T_n. The solid curve is the density of the Gumbel distribution.

Simulation 1. In the stochastic block model setting, we examine how well the Gumbel limiting distribution approximates the empirical distribution of the test statistic T_n. We set $n = 500$ and $k = 3$ with $\pi_1 = \pi_2 = \pi_3 = 1/3$. The edge probability between communities u and v is $B_{uv} = 0.1(1 + 2 \times \mathbf{1}(u = v))$. Figure 1 plots the distribution of T_n from 200 replications. We can see that the empirical distribution can be well approximated by the limiting distribution.

Simulation 2. In the stochastic block model setting, given $\sigma_0 = \sigma$ (σ_0 is derived by a consistent community detection method, e.g., spectral clustering), we simulate the probability of type I error and the power of the test statistic T_n under the hypothesis test

$$H_0 : k = k_0 \ \ vs \ \ H_1 : k < k_0.$$

Here, k denotes the true block number and k_0 is the fitted block number. The network size n is 1000 with equal sized communities. The edge probability between communities u and v is $0.1(1 + 2 \times \mathbf{1}(u = v)$. Each simulation is repeated 200 times. The simulation results are



Figure 2: Degree corrected stochastic block model: empirical distributions of T_{n1}, T_{n2} and T_{n3}. The solid curve is the density of the Gumbel distribution.

given in Table 1. It can be seen from this table that the probability of type I error is close to nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$, especially for small k. We can also see from this table that when the difference between the true block number k and the fitted block number k_0 increases, the power becomes larger.

Table 1: Proportion of rejection at nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$.

	T_n				Lei (2016)			
k	3	5	7	9	3	5	7	9
$k_0 = 3$	0.04				0.28			
$k_0 = 5$	0.64	0.06			0.94	0.35		
$k_0 = 7$	0.94	0.44	0.10		1.00	0.98	0.34	
$k_0 = 9$	1.00	0.50	0.40	0.21	1.00	1.00	0.96	0.46

We also compare our method with Lei (2016). It can be seen from Table 1 that the probability of type I error of our method is smaller than that of Lei (2016).

Simulation 3. In the stochastic block model setting, given $k_0 = k$, we simulate the

probability of type I error of the test statistic T_n under the hypothesis test

$$H_0 : \sigma = \sigma_0 \ \ vs \ \ H_1 : \sigma \neq \sigma_0.$$

Here, σ_0 is derived by spectral clustering method. σ denotes the true block number and σ_0 is the fitted block number. The network size n is 1000 with equal sized communities. The edge probability between communities u and v is $r(1 + 2 \times \mathbf{1}(u = v))$. Each simulation is repeated 200 times. The simulation results are given in Table 2. It can be seen from this table that the probability of type I error is close to nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$, especially for large r. On the other hand, when r is fixed, the probability of type I error increases as k increases.

Table 2: Proportion of rejection at nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$.

	T_n			Lei (2016)		
r	0.02	0.05	0.1	0.02	0.05	0.1
$k_0 = k = 3$	0.12	0.04	0.04	0.69	0.27	0.28
$k_0 = k = 5$	0.62	0.15	0.06	0.93	0.44	0.35
$k_0 = k = 7$	1.00	0.39	0.10	1.00	0.56	0.34
$k_0 = k = 9$	1.00	0.88	0.21	1.00	0.75	0.46

We also compare our method with Lei (2016). It can be seen from Table 2 that the probability of type I error of our method is smaller than that of Lei (2016).

Simulation 4. In the degree corrected stochastic block model setting, we examine how well the Gumbel limiting distribution approximates the empirical distribution of the test statistic. We set $n = 500$ and $k = 3$ with $\pi_1 = \pi_2 = \pi_3 = 1/3$. In choosing the parameters ω and B to generate networks from the degree corrected stochastic block model, we follow the approach used in Zhao, Levina and Zhu (2012). The identifiability constraint $\sum_i \omega_i \mathbf{1}\{\sigma(i) = u\} = |\sigma^{-1}(u)|$ for each community $1 \leq u \leq k$ is replaced by the requirement that the ω_i be

independently generated from a distribution with unit expectation

$$\omega_i = \begin{cases} \eta_i, & \text{w.p. } 0.8; \\ 9/11, & \text{w.p. } 0.1; \\ 13/11, & \text{w.p. } 0.1, \end{cases}$$

where η_i is uniformly distributed on the interval $[\frac{4}{5}, \frac{6}{5}]$. The edge probability between communities u and v is $B_{uv} = 0.1(1 + 2 \times \mathbf{1}(u = v))$. Each simulation is repeated 200 times. In Figure 2, (a), (b) and (c) plot the empirical distributions of T_{n1}, T_{n2} and T_{n3}, respectively. It can be seen that the empirical distributions of T_{n1} and T_{n3} can be well approximated by the Gumbel distribution, whereas the empirical distribution of T_{n2} deviates from the Gumbel distribution.

Simulation 5. In the degree corrected stochastic block model setting, given $\sigma_0 = \sigma$ (σ_0 is derived by a consistent community detection method, e.g., SCORE), we simulate the probability of type I error and the power of the test statistics T_{n2} and T_{n3} under the hypothesis test

$$H_0 : k = k_0 \ \ vs \ \ H_1 : k < k_0.$$

The network size n is 1000 with equal sized communities. The edge probability between communities u and v is $0.1(1 + 2 \times \mathbf{1}(u = v))$. Each simulation is repeated 200 times. The simulation results are given in Tables 3. We can see that, for small k, the probability of type I error of the test statistics T_{n3} is smaller than that of T_{n2}.

Table 3: Proportion of rejection at nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$.

	T_{n2}				T_{n3}			
k	3	5	7	9	3	5	7	9
$k_0 = 3$	0.46				0.06			
$k_0 = 5$	1.00	0.19			0.98	0.06		
$k_0 = 7$	1.00	1.00	0.11		1.00	1.00	0.12	
$k_0 = 9$	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.07	1.00	1.00	1.00	0.16

Simulation 6. In the degree corrected stochastic block model setting, given $k_0 = k$, we

simulate the probability of type I error of the test statistics T_{n2} and T_{n3} under the hypothesis test

$$H_0 : \sigma = \sigma_0 \ \ vs \ \ H_1 : \sigma \neq \sigma_0.$$

Here, σ_0 is derived by SCORE. σ denotes the true block number and σ_0 is the fitted block number. The network size n is 1000 with equal sized communities. The edge probability between communities u and v is $r(1 + 2 \times \mathbf{1}(u = v))$. The simulation results are given in Table 4. It can be seen from this table that the probability of type I error of the test statistic T_{n3} is close to nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$, especially for large r. On the other hand, when r is fixed, the probability of type I error of the test statistic T_{n3} increases as k increases.

Table 4: Proportion of rejection at nominal level $\alpha = 0.05$.

	T_{n2}			T_{n3}		
r	0.02	0.05	0.1	0.02	0.05	0.1
$k_0 = k = 3$	0.45	0.60	0.46	0.16	0.06	0.06
$k_0 = k = 5$	0.75	0.09	0.19	0.93	0.06	0.06
$k_0 = k = 7$	1.00	0.28	0.11	1.00	0.47	0.12
$k_0 = k = 9$	1.00	1.00	0.07	1.00	1.00	0.16

We can also see that, for small k, the probability of type I error of the test statistics T_{n3} is smaller than that of T_{n2}.

4.2 Data example

4.2.1 International trade dataset

In this subsection, we study an international trade dataset collected by Westveld and Hoff (2011). It contains yearly international trade data among $n = 58$ countries from 1981–2000. One can refer to Westveld and Hoff (2011) for a detail description. This dataset was revisited by Saldana, Yu and Feng (2016) for the purpose of estimating the number of communities. Following their paper, we only focus on data from 1995 and transform the weighted adjacency matrix to the binary matrix using their methods. An adjacency matrix A is created by first

considering a weight matrix W with $W_{ij} = \text{Trade}_{ij} + \text{Trade}_{ji}$, where $Trade_{ij}$ denotes the value of exports from country i to country j. Define $A_{ij} = 1$ if $W_{ij} \geq W_\alpha$, and $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise, here W_α denotes the α-th quantile of $\{W_{ij}\}_{1\leq i<j\leq n}$. We set $\alpha = 0.5$ as in Saldana, Yu and Feng (2016). Saldana, Yu and Feng (2016) used three different methods to conclude that the number of communities are $3, 7, 10$ respectively. We use T_n as the test statistic for the stochastic block model. The member vector σ_0 is derived by the spectral clustering. We first consider the case $H_0 : k = 7$. We computed $t_n = 11.16$ (after removing about 10 percent singular values of ρ_{iv}), and the corresponding p-value is about 0.001. Thus, at the level of 0.05, we would reject H_0. By a similar discussion, we would reject $H_0 : k = 10$ at the level 0.05. For $H_0 : k = 3$, we computed $t_n = -2.15$ (again after removing about 10 percent singular values of ρ_{iv}), and the corresponding p-value is about 0.45. Thus, at the level of 0.05, we would not reject $H_0 : k = 3$.

4.2.2 Political blog dataset

In this subsection, we use the political blog network [Adamic and Glance (2005)] to demonstrate the proposed method. The data consists of political blogs, with edges representing web links. Each node is labeled either as "conservative" or "liberal" based on the blogger's political stance. We only consider the largest connected component of this network which consists of 1222 nodes as is commonly done in the literature. Chen and Lei (2014) proposed a network cross-validation method and applied it to the political blog network to select the number of communities; they identified $k = 10$ and $k = 2$ respectively for the stochastic block model and the degree corrected stochastic block model. Here, we reanalyze the data using the test statistics that we have developed to test the significance of the block number identified by Chen and Lei (2014). Specifically, we use T_n and T_{n3} as the test statistic for the stochastic block model and the degree corrected stochastic block model, respectively. We first consider the case $H_0 : k = 10$ under the stochastic block model; we computed

$t_n = -8.16$ (after removing about 10 percent singular values of ρ_{iv}), and the corresponding p-value is about 0. Thus, at the level of 0.05, we would reject $H_0 : k = 10$. For the case of $H_0 : k = 2$ under the degree corrected stochastic block model, we computed $t_{n3} = 3.98$ (again after removing about 10 percent singular values of τ_{iv}), and the corresponding p-value is 0.16. Thus, at the level of 0.05, we would not reject $H_0 : k = 2$. The result of our analysis agrees with that of Chen and Lei (2014) for the degree corrected stochastic block model but not so for the stochastic block model. It is possible that the stochastic block model is not an appropriate model for this particular data set as it was observed that there is a big variation among node degrees.

5 Discussion

In this paper, we have developed a novel goodness-of-fit test based on the maximum entry-wise deviation of the centered and re-scaled observed adjacency matrix and demonstrated that its asymptotic null distribution is the Gumbel distribution when $k = O(n/\log n)$, which significantly relaxes the condition in Lei (2016). The test is different from those used in traditional methods on independent random variables in which the goodness-of-fit is usually assessed by the sum of residual squares. For stochastic block models, the residual is a matrix. The proposed test incorporates the signal change among different blocks nested in the residual matrix to test the goodness-of-fit of the model.

We note that we have only considered dense networks. In practice, networks are often sparse. To admit the sparse case, the probability matrix B is often assumed to be of the form $B = \rho_n B_0$, where the entries of B_0 are of order 1 and ρ_n is a parameter controlling the sparsity of the network [Bickel and Chen (2009)]. It would be of interests to see whether the proposed method can be extended to cover this case.

6 Appendix

In this section, we give the proof of Theorem 1. We start with three lemmas that will be used in the proof. The following Poisson approximation result is essentially a special case of Theorem 1 in Arritia, Goldstein and Gordon (1989).

Lemma 1 (Arritia, Goldstein and Gordon (1989)). *Let I be an index set and $\{\mathbf{B}_\alpha, \alpha \in I\}$ be a set of subsets of I, that is, $\mathbf{B}_\alpha \subset I$. Let also $\{\eta_\alpha, \alpha \in I\}$ be random variables. For a given $t \in \mathbb{R}$, set $\lambda = \sum_{\alpha\in I} P(\eta_\alpha > t)$. Then*

$$| P(\max_{\alpha\in I} \eta_\alpha \leq t) - e^{-\lambda} | \leq (1 \wedge \lambda^{-1})(b_1 + b_2 + b_3),$$

where

$$b_1 = \sum_{\alpha\in I} \sum_{\beta\in \mathbf{B}_\alpha} P(\eta_\alpha > t)P(\eta_\beta > t), \ b_2 = \sum_{\alpha\in I} \sum_{\alpha\neq\beta\in \mathbf{B}_\alpha} P(\eta_\alpha > t, \eta_\beta > t),$$

$$b_3 = \sum_{\alpha\in I} E \mid P(\eta_\alpha > t | \sigma(\eta_\beta, \beta \notin \mathbf{B}_\alpha)) - P(\eta_\beta > t) \mid,$$

and $\sigma(\eta_\beta, \beta \notin \mathbf{B}_\alpha)$ is the σ-algebra generated by $\{\eta_\beta, \beta \notin \mathbf{B}_\alpha\}$. In particular, if η_α is independent of $\{\eta_\beta, \beta \notin \mathbf{B}_\alpha\}$ for each α, then $b_3 = 0$.

The following moderate deviation result is from Chen (1990).

Lemma 2 (Chen (1990)). *Suppose $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_n$ are i.i.d random variables with $E\xi_1 = 0$ and $E\xi_1^2 = 1$. Set $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$. Let $0 < \alpha \leq 1$ and $\{a_n : n \geqq 1\}$ satisfy that $a_n \to \infty$ and $a_n = o(n^{\alpha/(2(2-\alpha))})$. If $Ee^{t_0|\xi_1|^\alpha} < \infty$ for some $t_0 > 0$, then*

$$\lim_n \frac{1}{a_n^2} \log P(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n}a_n} \geq \mu) = -\frac{\mu^2}{2}$$

for any $\mu > 0$.

The following result is from Cai and Jiang (2011).

Lemma 3 (Cai and Jiang (2011)). *Suppose $\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_n$ are i.i.d random variables with $E\xi_1 = 0$, $E\xi_1^2 = 1$ and $Ee^{t_0|\xi_1|^\alpha} < \infty$ for some $t_0 > 0$ and $0 < \alpha \leq 1$. Set $S_n = \sum_{i=1}^n \xi_i$ and $\beta = \alpha/(2+\alpha)$. Then, for any $\{p_n : n \geqq 1\}$ with $0 < p_n \to \infty$ and $\log p_n = o(n^\beta)$ and $\{y_n; n \geq 1\}$ with $y_n \to y > 0$,*

$$P(\frac{S_n}{\sqrt{n \log p_n}} \geq y_n) \sim \frac{p_n^{-y_n^2/2}(\log p_n)^{-1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi} y}$$

as $n \to \infty$.

Proof of Theorem 1. By Hoeffding's (1963) inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned} P(\max_{1\leq i\leq j\leq n} \mid P_{ij} - \hat{P}_{ij} \mid > t) &= P(\max_{1\leq u\leq v\leq k} \mid B_{uv} - \hat{B}_{uv} \mid > t) \\ &\leq \sum_{1\leq u\leq v\leq k} P(\mid B_{uv} - \hat{B}_{uv} \mid > t) \\ &= \sum_{1\leq u\leq v\leq k} P(\mid P_{ij} - \hat{P}_{ij} \mid > t) \\ &\leq k^2 e^{-2|\sigma_0^{-1}(u)||\sigma_0^{-1}(v)|t^2} \\ &\leq e^{2\log k - 2|\sigma^{-1}(u)||\sigma^{-1}(v)|t^2} = e^{2\log k - 2C^2 n^2 t^2/k^2}. \end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$\max_{1\leq i\leq j\leq n} \mid P_{ij} - \hat{P}_{ij} \mid = o_p(\frac{k\log n}{n}).$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n,0} &\triangleq \max_{1\leq i\leq n, 1\leq v\leq k_0} \mid \rho_{iv,0} \mid \\ &= \max_{1\leq i\leq n, 1\leq v\leq k} \mid \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma^{-1}(v)|}} \sum_{j\in\sigma^{-1}(v)} \frac{A_{ij}-P_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}} \mid, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} L_{n,1} &\triangleq \max_{1\leq i\leq n, 1\leq v\leq k_0} \mid \rho_{iv,1} \mid \\ &= \max_{1\leq i\leq n, 1\leq v\leq k} \mid \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma^{-1}(v)|}} \sum_{j\in\sigma^{-1}(v)} \frac{A_{ij}-\hat{P}_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}} \mid \\ &= \max_{1\leq i\leq n, 1\leq v\leq k} \mid \rho_{iv,0} + \frac{P_{ij}-\hat{P}_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}} \mid \\ &= L_{n,0} + o_P(1). \end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
L_{n,2} &\triangleq \max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k_0} \mid \rho_{iv,2} \mid \\
&= \max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} \mid \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma^{-1}(v)|}} \sum_{j\in\sigma^{-1}(v)} \frac{A_{ij}-\hat{P}_{ij}}{\sqrt{\hat{P}_{ij}(1-\hat{P}_{ij})}} \mid \\
&= \max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} \mid \rho_{iv,1} \mid \frac{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}}{\sqrt{\hat{P}_{ij}(1-\hat{P}_{ij})}} \\
&= L_{n,1} \frac{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}}{\sqrt{\hat{P}_{ij}(1-\hat{P}_{ij})}} \\
&= L_{n,0} + o_P(1).
\end{aligned}
$$

To prove Theorem 1 (1), it is sufficient to show:

$$
\frac{L_{n,0}}{\sqrt{\log(2kn)}} \to \sqrt{2}
$$

in probability as $n \to \infty$.

We first prove

$$
\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\frac{L_{n,0}}{\sqrt{\log(2kn)}} \le \sqrt{2} - \epsilon) = 0,
$$

for any $\epsilon > 0$ small enough.

Let $y_n = (\sqrt{2} - \epsilon)\sqrt{\log(2kn)}$, $I = \{(i,v) | 1 \le i \le n, 1 \le v \le k\}$, $\mathbf{B}_{iv} = \{(s,t) \in I/\{(i,v)\} | s = i\}$. Then $\mid \mathbf{B}_{iv} \mid = k - 1$. Since $\frac{A_{ij}-P_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}}$ is i.i.d with $E\frac{A_{ij}-P_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}} = 0$ and $E(\frac{A_{ij}-P_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}})^2 = 1$, by Lemma 1,

$$
\mid P(\max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} |\rho_{iv,0}| \le y_n) - e^{-\lambda_n} \mid \le b_1 + b_2,
$$

where $\lambda_n = \sum_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} P(|\rho_{iv,0}| > y_n)$. By Lemma 2,

$$
\begin{aligned}
\lambda_n &= \sum_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} P(|\rho_{iv,0}| > y_n) \\
&\le 2kne^{-(\sqrt{2}-\epsilon)^2 \log(2kn)/2} \\
&= e^{\log(2kn) - (\sqrt{2}-\epsilon)^2 \log(2kn)/2} \\
&\to \infty,
\end{aligned}
$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_1 &= \sum_{\alpha\in I}\sum_{\beta\in \mathbf{B}_\alpha} P(\eta_\alpha > y_n)P(\eta_\beta > y_n) \\ &< 4k^2 n e^{-(\sqrt{2}-\epsilon)^2\log(2kn)} \\ &= e^{\log(4k^2n)-(\sqrt{2}-\epsilon)^2\log(2kn)} \\ &= o(1), \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} b_2 &= \sum_{\alpha\in I}\sum_{\alpha\neq\beta\in \mathbf{B}_\alpha} P(\eta_\alpha > y_n, \eta_\beta > y_n)) \\ &< 4k^2 n e^{-(\sqrt{2}-\epsilon)^2\log(2kn)} \\ &= e^{\log(4k^2n)-(\sqrt{2}-\epsilon)^2\log(2kn)} \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

for sufficient large n. To finish the proof, we only need to show that for any $\epsilon > 0$,

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} P(\frac{L_{n,0}}{\sqrt{\log(2kn)}} \geq \sqrt{2}+\epsilon) = 0.$$

By Lemma 2,

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tfrac{L_{n,0}}{\sqrt{\log(2kn)}} \geq \sqrt{2}+\epsilon) &= P(\max_{1\leq i\leq n, 1\leq v\leq k} \mid \rho_{iv,0} \mid \geq \sqrt{2}+\epsilon) \\ &\leq 2kne^{-(\sqrt{2}+\epsilon)^2\log(2kn)/2} \\ &= e^{\log(2kn)-(\sqrt{2}+\epsilon)^2\log(2kn)/2} \\ &= o(1) \end{aligned}$$

for sufficient large n.

Next, we show the second part (2) of Theorem 1. Similar to the proof of Theorem 1 (1), it is sufficient to show

$$\lim_n P(L_{n,0}^2 - 2\log(2kn) + \log\log(2kn) \leq y) = \exp\{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}}e^{-y/2}\}.$$

Let $y_n = \sqrt{y + 2\log(2kn) - \log\log(2kn)}$, $I = \{(i,v)|1 \leq i \leq n, 1 \leq v \leq k\}$, $\mathbf{B}_{iv} = \{(s,t) \in I/\{(i,v)\}|s = i\}$. Then $\mid \mathbf{B}_{iv} \mid = k-1$. Since $\frac{A_{ij}-P_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}}$ is i.i.d with $E\frac{A_{ij}-P_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}} = 0$

and $E(\frac{A_{ij}-P_{ij}}{\sqrt{P_{ij}(1-P_{ij})}})^2 = 1$, by Lemma 1,

$$\mid P(\max_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} |\rho_{iv,0}| \le y_n) - e^{-\lambda_n} \mid \le b_1 + b_2,$$

where $\lambda_n = \sum_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} P(|\rho_{iv,0}| > y_n)$. By Lemma 3,

$$\begin{aligned}
&P(\mid \rho_{iv,0} \mid > y_n) \\
&= P(\frac{\rho_{iv,0}}{\sqrt{\log(2kn)}} > \sqrt{\frac{y+2\log(2kn)-\log\log(2kn)}{\log(2kn)}}) \\
&\sim (2kn)^{-\frac{y+2\log(2kn)-\log\log(2kn)}{2\log(2kn)}} (\log(2kn))^{-\frac{1}{2}}/(2\sqrt{\pi}) \\
&= (2kn)^{-1}(2kn)^{-\frac{y}{2\log(2kn)}} (2kn)^{\frac{\log\log(2kn)}{2\log(2kn)}} (\log(2kn))^{-\frac{1}{2}}/(2\sqrt{\pi}) \\
&= (2kn)^{-1} e^{-\frac{y}{2\log(2kn)}\log(2kn)} e^{\frac{\log\log(2kn)}{2\log(2kn)}\log(2kn)} (\log(2kn))^{-\frac{1}{2}}/(2\sqrt{\pi}) \\
&= (2kn)^{-1} e^{-\frac{y}{2}} e^{\log((\log(2kn))^{\frac{1}{2}}} (\log(2kn))^{-\frac{1}{2}}/(2\sqrt{\pi}) \\
&= (2kn)^{-1} e^{-\frac{y}{2}} (\log(2kn))^{\frac{1}{2}} (\log(2kn))^{-\frac{1}{2}}/(2\sqrt{\pi}) \\
&= (2kn)^{-1} e^{-\frac{y}{2}}/(2\sqrt{\pi}).
\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_n &= \sum_{1\le i\le n, 1\le v\le k} P(|\rho_{iv,0}| > y_n) \\
&= kn\frac{(kn)^{-1}}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{y}{2}} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{y}{2}}.
\end{aligned}$$

Similar to the proof in Theorem 1 (1), $b_1 = o(1)$, $b_2 = o(1)$. Thus,

$$\lim_n P(L_{n,0} \le y_n) = \exp\{-\frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{y}{2}}\}.$$

References

Adamic, L.A. and Glance, N. (2005). The political blogosphere and the 2004 US election. *In Proceedings of the WWW-2005 Workshop on the Weblogging Ecosystem 36-43.* ACM.

Amini, A. A., Chen, A., Bickel, P. J. and Levina, E. (2013). Pseudo-likelihood methods for community detection in large sparse networks. *The Annals of Statistics*, **41**, 2097–2122.

Airoldi, E. M., Blei, D. M., Fienberg, S. E., and Xing, E. P. (2008). Mixed membership stochastic blockmodels. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, **9**, 1981–2014.

Arritia, R, Goldstein, L. and Gordon, L.. (1989). Two moments suffice for Poisson approximations: The Chen-Stein method. *The Annals of Probability*, **17**, 9-25.

Bhattacharyya S. and Bickel P. J. (2015). Spectral clustering and block models: a review and a new algorithm. Preprint. arXiv:1508.01819.

Bickel, P. J. and Chen, A. (2009). A nonparameter view of network models and Newman-Girvan and other modularities. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* **106**, 21068-21073.

Bickel, P. J. and Sarkar, P. (2015). Hypothesis testing for automated community detection in networks. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society: Series B*, **78**, 253-273.

Cai, T. T. and Jiang, T. (2011). Limiting laws of coherence of random matrices with applications to testing covariance structure and construction of compressed sensing matrices. *The Annals of Statistics*, **39**, 1496-1525.

Chen, X. (1990). Probabilities of moderate deviations for B-valued independent ran-dom vectors. *Chinese Annals of Mathematics*, **11**, 621-629.

Chen, K. and Lei, J. (2014). Network cross-validation for determining the number of communities in network data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, to appear.

Choi, D. S., Wolfe, P. J. and Airoldi, E. M. (2012). Stochastic blockmodels with a growing number of classes. *Biometrika*, **99**, 273–284.

Daudin, J. J., Picard, F. and Robin, S. (2008). A mixture model for random graphs. *Statistics and Computing*, **18**, 173–183.

Gao, C., Ma, Z., Zhang, Y. and Zhou, H. (2016). Community detection in degree corrected block models. Preprint. arXiv:1607.06993.

Hoeffding, W. (1963). Probability inequalities for sums of bounded random variables. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **58**, 13–30.

Holland, P. W., Laskey, K. B. and Leinhardt, S. (1983). Stochastic blockmodels: First steps. *Social Networks*, **5**, 109–137.

Jin, J. (2015). Fast community detection by SCORE. *The Annals of Statistics*, **43**, 57–89.

Karrer, B. and Newman, M. E. J. (2011). Stochastic blockmodels and community structure in networks. *Physical Review E*(3), **83**, 016107.

Lei, J. (2016). A goodness-of-fit test for stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **44**, 401–424.

Lei, J. and Rinaldo, A. (2015). Consistency of spectral clustering in stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **43**, 215–237.

Newman, M. E. J. (2006). Modularity and community structure in networks. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **103**, 8577–8582.

Nowicki, K. and Snijders, T. A. B. (2001). Estimation and prediction for stochastic block-structures. *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, **96**, 1077–1087.

Rohe, K., Chatterjee, S. and Yu, B. (2011). Spectral clustering and the high-dimensional stochastic blockmodel. *The Annals of Statistics*, **39**, 1878–1915.

Rohe, K., Qin, T. and Fan, H. (2014). The highest dimensional stochastic blockmodel with a regularized estimator. *Statistica Sinica*, **24**, 1771–1786.

Saldana, D. F., Yu, Y. and Feng, Y. (2016). How many communities are there?. *Journal of Computational and Graphical Statistics*, to appear. .

Sarkar, P. and Bickel, P. J. (2015). Role of normalization in spectral clustering for stochastic blockmodels. *The Annals of Statistics*, **43**, 962–990.

Snijders, T. A. B. and Nowicki, K. (1997). Estimation and prediction for stochastic block models for graphs with latent block structure. *Journal of Classification*, **14**, 75–100.

Wang, Y. X. R. and Bickel, P. J. (2016). Likelihood-based model selection for stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, to appear.

Westveld, A. H. and Hoff, P. D. (2011). A mixed effects model for longitudinal relational and network data with applications to international trade and conflict. *The Annals of Applied Statistics*, 5, 843–872.

Zhang, A. Y. and Zhou, H. H. (2015). Minimax rates of community detection in stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, to appear.

Zhao, Y., Levina, E. and Zhu, J. (2012). Consistency of community detection in networks under degree-corrected stochastic block models. *The Annals of Statistics*, **40**, 2266–2292.